

relief program to feed those left homeless and without food by World War II. Perhaps his most far-reaching contribution was as the head of the State Department's policy planning staff in the Truman administration. Working under Dean Acheson and along with other influential thinkers such as Charles Bohlen and George Kennan, Nitze was the principal author of the National Security Council document, entitled "United States Objectives and Programs for National Security," but more commonly known as NSC-68, that provided the strategic outline for the conduct of deterrence during the Cold War.

Key insights from NSC-68 still ring true today.

For example, NSC-68 situated our strategy towards the former Soviet Union in a broader world context. It stated, in part:

Our overall policy at the present time may be described as one designed to foster a world environment in which the American system can survive and flourish. It therefore rejects the concept of isolation and affirms the necessity of our positive participation in the world community. This broad intention embraces two subsidiary policies. One is a policy which we would probably pursue even if there were no Soviet threat. It is a policy of attempting to develop a healthy international community. The other is the policy of "containing" the Soviet system. These two policies are closely interrelated and interact on one another. Nevertheless, the distinction between them is basically valid and contributes to a clearer understanding of what we are trying to do.

Paul Nitze continued to make significant contributions to our national security through the 1960s, as Secretary of the Navy under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Johnson.

President Nixon appointed Nitze to the U.S. delegation to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviet Union in 1969, and he played an important role in negotiating the ABM Treaty with Moscow during that time. Under Presidents Nixon and Ford, he served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs.

During the term of President Carter, Nitze played a seminal role as an external critic of national security policy. His stature was such that his opposition to the SALT II Treaty negotiated by President Carter was an important factor in its failure to garner support in the U.S. Senate.

Yet, his reputation as a hard-liner on defense was too simplistic a characterization for his formidable intellect and ability to respond to new realities with new strategies to maintain U.S. security.

The most famous example, perhaps, of this characteristic was Paul Nitze's famous "walk in the woods" with his Soviet counterpart in arms control negotiations, Yuli Kvitsinsky. His informal proposal to put drawdowns in intermediate-range nuclear missiles in a broader context of arms reductions was considered too radical at the time, and was rejected by both sides. Yet, only a

few years later, a more comprehensive approach is precisely what both sides agreed to, for in 1987 the United States and the Soviet Union signed the so-called "double zero" agreement that limited all medium-range missiles in Europe as shorter-range missiles as well.

But perhaps the most important lessons we can learn is from the pattern of Paul Nitze's life and contributions. At this time, when the news headlines are dominated with stories of transitions and resignations from the Executive Branch, covered like a sports story of who's won and who's lost, the tendency is to think of those leaving public service as persons who have had their shot, and are not likely to be heard from ever again. I think that the example of Paul Nitze shows how much the United States stands to lose if we were to fall into such an unfortunate way of thinking with respect to public service.

I for one hope some of those who are now leaving public service will in the future find additional ways to serve their country, as Paul Nitze found ways to serve his country over many decades. I hope Paul Nitze's life and career will inspire all of us to a vision of how our Nation can benefit from the extraordinary expertise of its citizens who are willing to respond to the call to public service.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF FRANCIS J. HARVEY TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session for consideration of Executive Calendar No. 915, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis J. Harvey, of California, to be Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the President's nomination of Dr. Francis J. Harvey to be Secretary of the U.S. Army. Dr. Harvey was nominated by the President to be Secretary of the Army on September 15, this year. The Armed Services Committee conducted a hearing on Dr. Harvey's nomination on October 6. The committee voted favorably on the nomination on October 7. At that meeting there was some expression in opposition by members of the

committee, but the majority of the committee voted in favor.

At the hearing, there was a fair exchange of viewpoints, recognizing that Dr. Harvey is coming to this position from outside of the Department of Defense and has, during the course of his distinguished career, not a specific opportunity to form opinions about some of the key issues that confront the U.S. Army today.

No one should underestimate the challenges that have been faced by the Army and in large measure have been met by the Army under the distinguished leadership of the Acting Secretary of the Army and the current Chief of Staff of the Army. I commend both of them, who are daily meeting the new challenges as they arise.

There will be today in the course of this debate, and I shall await other Members coming to the floor, expressions of opinion different from what I am providing the Senate today so I will wait until such time as they may appear and then seek under my time the opportunity to rebut their views.

At the hearing of the committee on October 6, I indicated that Dr. Harvey has had an extraordinary career—and I underline very extraordinary career—as a business executive with extensive experience leading and managing very large corporate enterprises, particularly program-based organizations involved in the development and deployment of technology and systems.

As the Army goes through its transformation, he will have the opportunity to provide unique decision-making ability given his experience in those areas.

Dr. Harvey has a solid record of achievement in the private sector in areas related to transformation, financial management, and contracting which, as I said, will serve him very well if confirmed by the Senate as Secretary of the Army.

At the nomination hearing, as those in attendance will recall, I went to some length to emphasize that there is another side to the Army and that is the human side. I was privileged at one time in my lifetime to be in the Department of Defense and to be Secretary of the Navy. It is not all contracts and negotiations and things of that nature; there is a very strong family side to each of the military departments. I referred to it in that hearing as the human side. That reflects the hopes and aspirations and patriotism of soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and their families.

The family today has an ever increasing role in the life of the uniformed member of that family, be he male or female. Families now are instrumental in the decision process by which members of the military at the time they are up for consideration elect continuing service, to retire, or otherwise step aside and join the private sector. It is often the decision of the family that controls that sailor, airman, marine, as he or she makes that decision.